



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

has been weighed and found wanting by Dr. Farnell, the learned author of *Cults of the Greek States* and other works on the religion of Greece.

One cannot show the thoroughness of Dr. Farnell's book better than by quoting, as far as possible, the author's own striking summaries.

After a statement of the problem and the evidence (chap. ii), the author takes up a discussion of the morphology of the compared religions (chap. iii), and finds that "we must regard the religious structure to which the cults of Anatolia and Mesopotamia belonged as morphologically the same as the Hellenic" (p. 40). The predominance of the goddess in the religions compared is taken up in chap. v. Here the comparison shows that the Hellenes did not bring with them into Greece the supremacy of the goddess, nor did they borrow it from the Semites (contrary to the opinion current among scholars long before pan-Babylonism was heard of), but found it on the soil, "a native growth of an old Mediterranean religion."

It is not, however, until the author compares the deities of the two civilizations (chaps. vi and vii), as nature-powers and as social powers, that the hopelessness of attempting to maintain that Greece borrowed from Babylon becomes evident. The Babylonian religion early took on an astral character, whereas the religion of the Hellenes "was pre-eminently concerned with mother-earth—with Ge-meter" (p. 114). Likewise the "political application of Hellenic religion seems wholly a native and independent product of the Hellenic spirit, and reflected the characteristically Hellenic forms of civic life" (p. 140).

Chap. ix treats of "Purity as a Divine Attribute." The mythology of the Babylonians is found to be strikingly pure. "It agrees in this respect with the Hebraic, and differs markedly from the Hellenic; the gods live in monogamic marriage with their respective goddesses, and we have as yet found no licentious stories of their intrigues" (p. 164). This is a very important point, for it is just the mythological stories of a people that are likely to be borrowed by others.

"Again, Babylonian magic is essentially demoniac; but we have no evidence suggesting that the pre-Homeric Greek was demon-ridden, or that demonology and exorcism were leading factors of his consciousness and practice: the earliest mythology does not suggest that he habitually imputed his physical or moral disorders to demons, nor does it convey any hint of the existence in the early society of that terrible functionary, the witch-finder, or the institution of witch-trials" (p. 178).

The religious temperament of Greeks and Babylonians differed in many important points (chap. xi). The Semite lived in the fear of the Lord. "The religious habit of the Hellene strikes us by comparison as sober, well-tempered, often genial, never ecstatically abject, but even—we may say—self-respecting. Tears for sin,

lamentations and sighs, the countenance bowed to the ground, the body cleaving to the pavement, these are not part of his ritual" (pp. 192-93).

While the eschatological ideas of the East and West (chap. xii) are in some respects similar, "it is perhaps the most salient and significant difference between Hellenic and Mesopotamian religions that in the latter we have no trace of mysteries at all, while in the former not only were they a most potent force in the popular religion, but were the chief agents for developing the eschatologic faith" (p. 220).

The comparison of the ritual (chap. xiii) likewise shows many similarities between the two religions, but entirely too many striking differences to permit of the theory of borrowing.

Religious Liberty. By Francesco Ruffini.

Translated by J. Parker Heyes, with a preface by J. B. Bury. New York: Putnam, 1912. \$3.50.

This book deserves a long and discriminating review. The author is professor of ecclesiastical law in the University of Turin. His learning is prodigious, and it is evident on almost every page. But the inadequacy of translation is apparent in numerous passages where the meaning is left in doubt. Yet upon the whole the work can be understood, and it will have to be reckoned with by all students of religious liberty whether considered in its historical development or in its abstract conception.

Ruffini defines religious liberty as a judicial idea. "It takes sides neither with faith nor with disbelief; but in that ceaseless struggle which has been waged between them since man first existed, and which will be continued, perhaps, as long as man exists, it stands absolutely apart."

He believes in some kind of state ecclesiastical control. It is only in a state church that religious liberty is possible. Of course in a state church there should be no bar to the growth of denominations. They should be allowed freely to do their own work in their own way. But the very zeal that led to separation renders all separatists intolerant. This he attempts to prove from the history of religious liberty, and from the actual present status of the subject. For example: In Catholic Italy Luigi Luzzati, a Jew, was prime minister, whereas in separatist America a Catholic could never be president. But clearly he does not understand the situation in America. Theoretically there is nothing to keep a Catholic from becoming president, and practically the Catholics are finding representation in all the great public offices of the country. For example, the chief justice of the Supreme Court is a Catholic, and one of the associate justices is a Catholic, and all political parties

bid for the Catholic vote. The reason for the "custom" to which Professor Ruffini attributes so much power is that the Catholic church is first, last, and always a powerful, strongly organized political party, whereas this is in no sense true of any of the other denominations.

It must be admitted, moreover, that as a matter of fact where there is a state church the separatist churches never do have a fair deal. For a conspicuous example take the present religious situation in England where the established church is seeking in every possible way to crowd Dissenters to the wall.

True religious liberty, Ruffini thinks, had its origin among the Socinians, and he almost would lead us to believe that wherever it has appeared it can be traced back to them. But many will find it difficult historically to connect up in all the cases that he suggests. They will rather be inclined to find explanations in the well-known principle that like causes tend to produce like effects.

Moreover, at the end of the book we are left with the conviction that in the opinion of the author religious liberty and religious indifferentism are very nearly synonymous. He seems to be conscious of this, for following the two currents of Socinianism and Separatism he says: "Finally we can admit that in the fundamental conception of the followers of the first current, and throughout their work there transpired the dominant and characteristic note of the whole of their mentality, that is to say, *skepticism*. But here we must also bring against separationism the charge of never having been able to divest itself completely of the character which was imprinted upon it at its birth—the character, let it be said without irreverence, of *fanaticism*."

But, as we have already suggested, no short notice can do justice to a book of such massive learning and elaboration.

The Poets of the Old Testament. By Alex. R. Gordon. New York: G. H. Doran Co., 1912. Pp. xiv+368. \$1.50.

The aim of this book is "to bring home the results [of much recent and important work upon the poetry of the Old Testament], as a unified whole, to the English reader."

This general purpose is here admirably accomplished. But Dr. Gordon has not failed to enrich the volume by much that is distinctly his own. The translations are all original, and the sympathetic appreciation of, and insight into, the soul of Hebrew poetry are not such as come at second hand.

An initial chapter sets forth the general characteristics of Hebrew poetry. Then the folk-poetry is listed and surveyed rapidly. This is followed by a study of the various kinds of

musical accompaniments to Hebrew song. Afterward, the books of Lamentations, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes are expounded in succession. Dr. Gordon has not given us another *Introduction to the Poetry of the Old Testament*, but rather an exposition of its contents. Questions of introduction are touched upon, to be sure, but only lightly; they are made wholly subsidiary to the more important task of interpretation.

As indicative of the author's critical standpoint, it may be noted that he declares that "it is now impossible to distinguish with any certainty the Davidic Element in the Psalter." That is, whatever Davidic psalms there were have been so edited and revised as to have lost nearly all semblance of their original form and content. The earliest psalms, in their present form, are placed in the days prior to the Exile; but the first "Davidic" Psalter was not completed until after the work of Ezra and Nehemiah. The second "Davidic" collection (Pss. 51-72) originated in the following century. Many psalms come from the late Persian and Greek periods, and not a few from the Maccabean age. The I of the Psalter represents to a large extent the Jewish community, rather than any individual speaker. The Book of Job originated in the period following the restoration from exile as a prose story of a pious man tried to the utmost, but steadfast throughout and finally rewarded with abundant prosperity. The poetical portion of the book was written, at a somewhat later date, by an author who was unable to heal the hurt of the daughter of his people so lightly. The Elihu speeches (chaps. 32-37) are a later contribution, and many other passages have been freely added to the original work by editors too solicitous regarding the effect of the books' unchallenged teachings.

The bulk of Proverbs, viz., chaps. 10-29, goes back, at least in collected form, only as far as the fourth century B.C.; while the rest of the book must be accounted for before the end of the third century B.C. The Song of Songs is a collection of love-songs, rather than a drama, and had its origin in the latter part of the third century B.C. In his treatment of Ecclesiastes, Dr. Gordon follows in the footsteps of McNeile and Barton.

Any student desirous of knowing what modern scholarship has to say about the origin and meaning of the poetic literature of the Old Testament will find here just what he needs. He will, furthermore, not be confronted continually by the dry bones of scholarship, but will be shown the way into a fuller understanding of this rich literature and a higher appreciation of the character of a people capable of producing such a series of exalted religious forms in the midst of conditions that were anything but helpful to the growth of faith in God.